

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action of August 24, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-15 and 18-23 are requested.

The Office Action

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Wu (US 6,591,128).

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Sodickson (US 6,717,406).

Claims 12, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Carrozzi (US 5,986,531).

Claim 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Carrozzi in view of Wu.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, first paragraph, and has been indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Claims 17, 18, and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Carrozzi in view of Su (US 6,768,303).

Claim 19 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Carrozzi in view of Su, further in view of the applicant's admitted prior art.

The Present Amendment Should Be Entered

This amendment should be entered because (1) it raises no issues that would require further search or consideration, and (2) it places the application in condition for allowance.

Claim 7 has been amended to incorporate half of the subject matter from claim 11. The Examiner already fully considered this combination in the prior Office Action when she examined claim 11. Claim 11 further restricted claim 7 in two ways: (1) adding the patient table and (2) calling for additional receive coils in the table. The Examiner has considered claim 7 and the combination of claim 7 and claim 11 and has rejected both claim 7 and claim 11 on the same grounds. Because both claim 7 and claim 11 were rejected on the same grounds, it is submitted that moving the first

part of claim 11 into its direct parent claim 11 raises no issues that require further search or consideration. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner has fully considered the subject matter of claim 7 (amended), when preparing the Final Rejection and that the amendment to claim 7 should be entered.

Further, this amendment places claim 7 in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below.

Independent claim 12 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claim 16 which was indicated to contain allowable subject matter.

Claim 19, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been placed in independent form.

Dependent claim 15, which is now inconsistent with independent claim 12 (amended), has been amended to depend from allowable claim 19, with which it is consistent. The claims which depended from claim 7 have been amended to depend from allowable claim 12 or 19. It is submitted that changing the dependency of claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, and 15 to depend from allowable claim 12 or 19 does not raise issues that would require further search or consideration.

The Claims Are Now in Condition For Allowance

Regarding **claim 7**, from the *Response to Arguments*, it is understood that the Examiner is interpreting the claimed housing as being embodied in structures **100** and **102** of Wu.

It is submitted that such an interpretation does not meet claim 10 as presented in the prior amendment or claim 7 (amended) in the present amendment. Claim 7 calls for the housing to define the **examination space** for receiving a body for examination. As set forth in the Remarks to the prior amendment, in the context of Wu, the applicant would interpret the housing as the cosmetic bore liner (not shown) in Wu which would line the bore **12** to separate the patient and the RF coil **38** and gradient coils **30, 32, 34**. Because this bore liner is primarily cosmetic, it is not illustrated in Wu (or most other MRI utility patent applications).

In order to emphasize the applicant's interpretation, claim 7 moves the requirement for the **patient table to be displaceable into and out of the examination space**. Again, claim 7 already calls for the examination space to be

defined by the housing. It is submitted that if the head coil 40 of Wu is interpreted as the housing, then the examination space defined by it would be the region inside the head coil which receives the head (illustrated in phantom of Figure 1 of Wu). Wu does not disclose a patient table which moves into and out of the head coil 40 or the "housing" 100, 102 defined thereby. Rather, it is submitted that an insertable head coil such as head coil 40 of Wu, is normally mounted on top of the patient table and moves into and out of the bore 12 therewith. Thus, the patient table would move into and out of the examination space defined by a bore liner housing which surrounds the bore 12 of Wu, but does not move into and out of an examination space defined by the insertable head coil 40 or its elements 100 and 102. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 7 currently amended is not anticipated by Wu, nor was claim 10 as previously presented anticipated by Wu.

Further, moving detachable receive coils on the housing which defines the bore 12 of Wu has advantages which are neither taught nor fairly suggested by Wu. The cost of superconducting magnets increases dramatically with increases in diameter. Moreover, increasing the diameter of gradient coils adds difficulty in maintaining precise gradients. Accordingly, there is pressure to make the superconducting magnet coils as small a diameter as possible. However, there is a counteracting commercial pressure to make the bore of the bore-type MRI scanner as large in diameter as possible. People in developed countries are becoming larger in circumference. Also, a larger bore diameter enables additional scan protocols to be performed. In some circumstances, it is advantageous to image the subject in other than a prone position. For example, the physician may want to image the knee in a flexed position, the spine in a flexed position, the shoulder with the arm in an elevated position, or the like. Having removable receive-only coils mounted at the circumference of the bore maximizes available imaging space, both when the detachable coils are present as well as when they are detached and adapts the scanner to different imaging protocols. Therefore, it is submitted that the difference between claim 7 and Wu is not trivial, but rather provides a significant advantage which is not apparent from Wu.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 7 is not anticipated by Wu.

Claim 12 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of **claim 16**, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Accordingly, it is submitted that **claim 12 and claims 2, 8, 13, and 14 dependent therefrom** now distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Claim 19, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been placed in independent form. Accordingly, it is submitted that **claim 19 and claims 4, 5, 10, 15, 18, and 20-23 dependent therefrom** distinguish patentably over the references of record.

Interview Summary

The applicants express their appreciation to Examiner Vargas for the courtesy of a telephone interview on September 27, 2007. The interview focused on allowable claim 16, specifically on language for placing claim 16 in independent form that resolves the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection and will still be considered allowable and will not require further search or consideration. The Examiner suggested deleting "permanently" from the claim and combining all of the other limitations of claims 12 and 16.

Claim 12 (Claim 16) Complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The Examiner directs the applicant's attention to page 10, second paragraph, which discusses an embodiment in which the cover plate **12, 42** with at least one dedicated receive coil **20** is a detachable part of the housing **10**.

However, **claim 16** does not require the cover plate to be permanently affixed to the housing. Rather, claim 16 requires the dedicated receive coils to be permanently affixed to the cover plate. On page 8, the first two paragraphs discussed a fixed, dedicated receive coil **20**. The third paragraph of page 8 through the first paragraph of page 10 describe various embodiments in which, it is submitted, the receive coil is permanently attached to the cover plate (see for example, the last line of page 9, the first paragraph of page 10, etc.).

Telephone Interview


The Examiner is requested to telephone Thomas Kocovsky at (216) 861-5582 for a Telephone Interview to discuss any issues remaining unresolved, such as any rephrasing for claim 16 to resolve the 35 U.S.C. § 112 issues while placing the subject matter which was indicated as patentable into its parent claim 12. Although it is submitted that claim 7 is in condition for allowance, the applicant is willing to discuss a potential Examiner's Amendment which the Examiner would agree places claim 7 in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-15 and 18-23 are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP



Thomas E. Kocovsky, Jr.
Reg. No. 28,383
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582